

EFS

Applicants: David S. Lawrence and Biao Xi

Appl. No.: 10/586,892

Filed: February 9, 2007

Reply filed August 19, 2010

page 6 of 7

REMARKS

Claim 1-16, 18-31 and 35-38 were pending in the subject application. Claims 5, 7-8, 22-23, 26, 31 and 35-38 are withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner as directed to non-elected species. By this amendment, Claims 19-26, 28-31 and 35-38 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and Claims 1 and 27 have been amended. Applicants maintain that the amendments to the claims do not raise an issue of new matter. Support for the amendments to Claim 1 can be found at least in Claims 19-21. Claim 27 was amended to correct claim dependency following the cancellation of Claim 19 and amendment to Claim 1. The amendments place the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicated that Claims 21, 24 and 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

In reply, Claim 1 has been rewritten to include the limitations of Claim 21 and intervening claims. Accordingly, Claim 1 and its dependent claims are understood to be allowable.

Reinstatement and allowance of withdrawn dependent species Claims 5, 7, and 8 are respectfully requested.

EFS

Applicants: David S. Lawrence and Biao Xi

Appl. No.: 10/586,892

Filed: February 9, 2007

Reply filed August 19, 2010

page 7 of 7

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

Claims 1-4, 6, 9-16, 18-20 and 27-30 are rejected under the enablement requirement for the full breadth of the claims. These rejections are understood to be obviated by the amendment made herein above.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the amendments and remarks made hereinabove, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in the June 22, 2010 Office Action and passage of the pending claims to allowance are respectfully requested. If there is any minor matter preventing the allowance of the subject application, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney.

No fee is deemed necessary in connection with the submission of this reply. However, if any fee is required to maintain the pendency of the subject application, authorization is hereby given to withdraw the amount of any such fee from Deposit Account No. 01-1785.

Respectfully submitted,

AMSTER, ROTHSTEIN & EBENSTEIN LLP
Attorneys for Applicants
90 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10016
(212) 336-8000

Dated: August 19, 2010
New York, New York

By /Alan D. Miller/
Alan D. Miller, Reg. No. 42,889